
Amalgamation of Man and Beast: What Did Ellen White Mean?

by Gordon Shigley

On September 8, 1947, fifteen of the Seventh-day Adventist church's highest officials gathered near San Francisco, California, to listen to two young Adventist biologists—Dr. Frank L. Marsh and Dr. Harold W. Clark—debate the meaning of two brief statements published in the mid-nineteenth century by their church's prophet, Ellen G. White. The biologists (both still alive and active) discussed whether Mrs. White's writings implied that sexual relations between men and animals had produced confused species, helped to deface God's image in man, and left traces of its activity lingering for all to see in certain unnamed races of men.

The explosive racial implications of such statements gave a sense of urgency to the debate. Controversy swirled around the implication that blacks descended from the sexual union of humans with animals. Had God revealed to Ellen White in a vision that blacks were not fully human? Through the years, critics and apologists of Ellen White had joined battle over this emotionally charged issue. Less tangible issues for the church loomed in the background. How and to what extent should religion accommodate scientific data that contradicts revelation? If Mrs. White's inspiration fell short of infallibility, what were its limits?

James McElhany, president of the

Gordon Shigley wrote this article while a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin.

church, assembled the distinguished tribunal along the far side of a long table that faced Marsh and Clark, who sat in front of bookshelves filled with Mrs. White's publications, while Milton Kern, president of the Board of Trustees of the Ellen G. White Publications, chaired the proceedings. Shortly after 9 a.m., Kern took the floor and gave a brief history of the controversy surrounding the amalgamation statements.

Mrs. White's statement first appeared in *Spiritual Gifts, Important Facts of Faith in Connection with the History of Holy Men of Old*, a four-volume set first published in 1864. After describing a series of antediluvian sins that included intermarriage between the righteous and wicked, idolatry, polygamy, theft, and murder, Ellen White wrote:

But if there was one sin above another which called for the destruction of the race by the flood, it was the base crime of amalgamation of man and beast which defaced the image of God and caused confusion everywhere. God purposed to destroy that powerful, long-lived race that had corrupted their ways before him.¹

Her second reference to amalgamation came in the next chapter and dealt with the amalgamation of man and beast that occurred after the Flood:

Every species of animal which God created were [sic] preserved in the ark. The confused species which God did not create, which were the result of amal-

gamation, were destroyed by the flood. Since the flood there has been amalgamation of man and beast as may be seen in the almost endless varieties of species of animals and in certain races of men.² Both statements later appeared in *The Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 1, and in the 1870 reorganization of the material in *Spiritual Gifts*. In 1871 they appeared again in *The Great Controversy*, Vol. 1, an alternate title for *The Spirit of Prophecy*.

Finally, almost 20 years later, both amalgamation statements were not included in the 1890 *Patriarchs and Prophets*. In the 1947 compilation, *The Story of Redemption*, the Ellen G. White Publications editors removed the questionable statements and even a few of the surrounding sentences that had appeared in *Patriarchs and Prophets*.

Kern noted that the statements had aroused controversy almost from the time Ellen White had published them in 1864. During the last 20 years, he continued, several men had offered different interpretations of Ellen White's statements, and it was the purpose of this meeting to hear from advocates of the two most widely publicized viewpoints, after which there would be an opportunity for questions and discussion. He then turned the floor over to Clark.

Clark rose and began by complimenting Marsh on his contribution to the study of creation. As far as their relation to the theory of evolution, he noted, they stood 100 percent shoulder to shoulder and were even in substantial agreement on many aspects of the amalgamation statements. The anxious church officials were relieved to find Clark and Marsh such good friends, and Clark's opening remarks helped to dispel some of the tension.

Clark then gave a brief summary of the context for the amalgamation statements, calling attention to their location at the end of a chapter detailing crimes committed by the antediluvians. It was difficult to read the statements within their contexts without seeing a series of sins, of which the last sin—the “one sin above another”—was obviously the climax. It was not likely that Ellen White was talking about intermarriage since she already had described that sin in an

earlier paragraph. Four years after the statements appeared, Uriah Smith, then editor of the Adventist organ *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, defended them in his *Visions of Mrs. E. G. White: A Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures* (1868) with an interpretation that gave no room for misunderstanding, and James White, Ellen's husband, had, in his own words, “carefully read the manuscript” before recommending the wide circulation of Smith's book.

The almost certain implication, continued Clark, was that Ellen White also had been interested in how Uriah Smith had defended her, and that she, too, had read the work. Clark called attention to his work with Ellen White's son, W. C. White, and D. E. Robinson, her secretary. Neither of these men ever had doubted that Ellen White meant the crossing of man and beast by the phrase “amalgamation of man and beast.” Although there was controversy over the statements, critics and supporters alike had accepted this interpretation. How easy it would have been to correct her critics in 1870 if she really had intended “the base crime of amalgamation of man and beast” to mean intermarriage between the races of Seth and Cain. It was a common practice, he continued, for Ellen White to make changes where her words had elicited a wrong interpretation, yet in this case she made no attempt at clarification even though critics had charged her with teaching that blacks were not human.

If one diagrammed the expression, “one sin above another was amalgamation of man and beast,” continued Clark, one could see that *man* and *beast* stand in the same relation in the sentence; they are coordinates. Whatever applies to one applies to the other, and it is impossible to make the amalgamation of beast with beast or man with man the one sin greater than idolatry, adultery, polygamy, theft, or murder. History showed that cohabitation with animals was one of the greatest sins of antiquity, for which there was abundant evidence. Furthermore, anthropologists had discovered human-like skulls in many parts of the world that showed peculiar ape-like affinities. Competent authorities had described characteristics of living tribes in

Africa and Malaysia that were of a distinctly simian nature. While there was no positive evidence that man and animals could cross today, there were, nevertheless, many facts to indicate that just such crosses may have taken place in the past. Moreover, God's commands to Israel specifically forbidding cohabitation of man and beast indicated that humanity was practicing this base crime. To say that amalgamation between man and beast never occurred in the past because it does not occur now, Clark stressed, is to take the same position of uniformitarianism that misled geologists. There was, in fact, only *one* objective fact that could not be explained: the lack of an authentic record of such a cross. This one fact did not justify the conclusion that the "one sin above another" committed by antediluvians was either interracial marriage or marriage between believers and unbelievers. Such an interpretation did violence to the language Ellen White actually used. On the contrary, two conclusions were clear: Ellen White knew what she meant to say, and she clearly intended her readers to interpret "the base crime" as a sexual act that included the crossing of man and beast.

It was now about 9:45 a.m., and Kern called on Marsh. He began with a few words of praise for Clark, and noted that they were good friends who merely had a professional difference of opinion on statements that always had been unclear as to precise meaning. He then called attention to the definition of amalgamation given by J. R. Bartlett in the 1859 *Dictionary of Americanisms*. In the United States the word "amalgamate" was applied universally to the mixing of black and white races, he noted, and only since the turn of the century had "hybridization" become a perfectly satisfactory substitute. But at the time Ellen White wrote the amalgamation statements, "the amalgamation of man" would call to the mind of the general reader a fusion of two races, in this case the ungodly race of Cain and the godly descendants of Seth. Neither the language of the statements themselves, the Scriptures, the findings of science, nor any other statements from the writings of Mrs. White demanded the conclusion that man had crossed *with* beast.

Suppose, he suggested, that in the first statement Ellen White had meant that man had crossed with beast. How could *both* of the stated results occur? True, God's image might be defaced, but would that cause confusion *everywhere*? Man could, after all, cohabit with no more than a few forms, and cohabitation was not synonymous with hybridization. The Scriptures made clear, he continued, that the principal sin that made the Flood necessary was coalescence of the "sons of God" and the "daughters of men." Furthermore, if the Holy Spirit actually had told Ellen White that man had crossed with beast, she would not have deleted the amalgamation statements from *Patriarchs and Prophets*.

Marsh now brought in the testimony of science. One of the most clearly demonstrated principles of biology, Marsh noted, was the fact that the different Genesis kinds of animals *will not cross*, not even to the extent of producing a sterile hybrid. There was no reason either from modern data or from the fossil record to suppose that this was not a law extending all the way back to Creation. If amalgamation of the Genesis kinds was the principal sin that made destruction of land forms necessary, we should be able to find these amalgamated forms as fossils. As for Uriah Smith's supposed defense of the amalgamation statements and Ellen White's unchanged reprinting of both statements two years later, that hardly proved that Ellen White meant that man had crossed with beast. Ellen White had made no statement whatsoever regarding Smith's defense. And furthermore, while it was difficult to explain how man could amalgamate with beast, it scarcely was necessary to explain how there could be an amalgamation of man with man. Marsh turned around to the wall of Ellen White books surrounding the conference room, reached for a copy of *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, and read from the bottom of page 499: "The enemy rejoiced in his success in effacing the divine image from the minds of the people . . . Through intermarriage with idolaters and constant association with them . . ." Marsh emphasized his point: "Ellen White said amalgamation defaced the image of God.

Here she says intermarriage effaced the divine image.”

Finally, Marsh brought up the sensitive issue of race. Those who insisted that evidence for amalgamation of man with beast could be seen in “certain races of men,” had the impossible task of pointing to races that were part human and part beast. The conclusion should be obvious: amalgamation of man defaced God’s image; amalgamation of races within the created kinds of animals produced confused species. We should not tarnish God’s priceless gift to Adventists by finding racial slurs in the statements and admonitions of Mrs. White, he concluded.³

Long before Marsh and Clark were active, Ellen White’s statements had elicited discussion as soon as they appeared in print. The controversy then had revolved around the issue of whether blacks were the result of hybridization of humans with beast. In *The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White*, an apology for Ellen White’s gift of prophecy, Uriah Smith answered 52 objections that critics had raised about Ellen White. Under “Objection 39: The Negro Race is not Human,” he argued that Ellen White had given the second amalgamation statement “for the purpose of illustrating the deep corruption and crime into which the race fell, even within a few years after the flood,”⁴ and not to teach that blacks were not human:

There was amalgamation; and the effect is still visible in “certain races of men.” Mark, those excepting the animals upon whom the effects of this work are visible, are called by the vision “men.” Now we have ever supposed that anybody that was called a *man*, was considered a human being.⁵ However, that the present races included descendants from men that had come into being as a result of man-animal crosses was beyond dispute, Smith argued, citing “such cases as the wild Bushmen of Africa, some tribes of the Hottentots, and perhaps the Digger Indians of our own country, etc.” Moreover, he claimed, naturalists found it

impossible “to tell just where the human ends and the animal begins. Can we suppose that this was so ordained of God in the beginning? Rather has not sin marred the boundaries of these two kingdoms?”⁶

Although Ellen White had not specified what races she wanted her readers to look upon as partial evidence for “the base crime,” Smith’s naming of specific races tended to support the contention that Ellen White had not expected anyone to encounter difficulty picturing the “certain races of men.” When Uriah Smith defended Ellen White’s amalgamation statements, he clearly reflected the popular idea of his time that crosses between men and animals had created a no-man’s-land between man and beast, populated by gorillas, chimpanzees, wild bushmen of Africa, Patagonians, and Hottentots.

“Uriah Smith . . . clearly reflected the popular idea of his time that crosses between men and animals had created a no-man’s-land between man and beast, populated by gorillas, chimpanzees, wild bushmen of Africa, Patagonians, and Hottentots.”

Uriah Smith’s views were compatible with students of the “American School” of anthropology, which was reaching its crest of influence in the United States by 1850. These anthropologists claimed that species could cross to produce intermediate forms of offspring.⁷ They argued that simple observation demonstrated that races of men were capable of crossing even though they constituted separate species that God had intended should remain separate. Samuel George Morton, founder of invertebrate paleontology in America and author of the controversial *Crania Americana* (1839), suggested that since drawings from Egyptian tombs, known to be at least 3,000 years old, showed the races every bit as distinct then as

now, it was unreasonable to assume that natural causes had produced the races in what could be "at most a thousand years" since the Flood.⁸ It was more likely that God had created the races from Noah's three sons, or perhaps at the Tower of Babel.

Realizing that hybridization would be the battleground on which they would win or lose their case, proponents of the "American School" attacked the validity of inter-fertility as a test for species. In 1847 Morton published a paper in the prestigious *American Journal of Science* that claimed hybrids existed between an amazing variety of organisms including deer and hog, bull and ewe, sheep and deer, as well as many crosses between different species of fish, birds, and insects.⁹

James White read Smith's book and warmly recommended it with the following notice in the August 25, 1868, *Review and Herald*:

The Association has just published a pamphlet entitled, "The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White, A Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures." It is written by the editor of the *Review*. While carefully reading the manuscript, I felt very grateful to God that our people could have this able defense of those views they so much love and prize, which others despise and oppose. This book is designed for very wide circulation.

—James White.¹⁰

James and Ellen White took 2,000 copies of Smith's book with them to campmeetings that year.¹¹

Despite Smith's defense of Ellen White's statements, controversy never wholly subsided. Even when Ellen White deleted the statements from her new book, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (1890), the old statements remained a topic of much discussion.

Forty years after the appearance of *Patriarchs and Prophets*, scientists had begun to cast a long shadow over Uriah Smith's already traditional interpretation. It could no longer be claimed, as Uriah Smith had once done, that "no one" denied the possibility of man-animal crosses. The amalgamation statements became a popular topic of discussion

among Adventists interested in natural science and revelation.

In the April 1931 issue of *The Ministry*, George McCready Price, the church's most prominent opponent of evolution, proposed to make a slight alteration in the wording of Ellen White's statements—the addition of a single word in brackets—that could reconcile them with science and remove all difficulty associated with the controversy.

Without attempting to deal with all the interesting statements in this passage, I may be allowed to say a few words about the latter part, which I think is the portion most liable to be misunderstood. Let me rewrite the last sentence, adding just one word in brackets, and I think the supposed difficulty will disappear almost of itself. "Since the flood, there has been amalgamation of man and (of) beast, as may be seen in the almost endless varieties of species of animals, and in certain races of men."¹²

Price was proposing two non-overlapping amalgamations—one for the races of man and another for union of the various kinds of animals.

His solution evoked a storm of opposition. One of the first to reply the same year was D. E. Robinson, for many years Ellen White's personal secretary. In a paper titled "Amalgamation Versus Evolution" Robinson said that Price's insertion of the word "of" into Ellen White's statement did violence to the "obvious meaning" that the author herself intended.¹³ He went on to argue that the amalgamation statements helped solve some of the problems in the conflict between science and religion, such as "how such a variety of animals . . . could have been produced in the short time allowed by Bible chronology . . ."¹⁴ and the problem of comparative anatomy:

Mrs. White's statement, if accepted, will solve the problems connected with the close physical resemblance between man and some of the apes, between whom and the tailed monkeys there are greater structural difference than between them and man. Any one who observes the chimpanzee, the gorilla, or the orang, would not find it difficult to believe

that they have some common ancestry with the human race.¹⁵

Just what races of man actually showed traces of animal ancestry, Robinson conceded, was impossible to determine; Mrs. White had not specified the "certain races of men."

Harold Clark's involvement with the problem of Ellen White's views on amalgamation began when his biology students at Pacific Union College continually asked him about Ellen White's amalgamation statements. After consulting with Elders W. C. White and Dores Robinson, the latter a secretary to Mrs. White and a cousin of Clark's first wife, Clark felt obliged to at least put forward hypotheses to provide a reasonable explanation for Ellen White's statements—for testing and study if nothing else.¹⁶ In 1940 he completed *Genes and Genesis*, which supported the traditional interpretation and suggested possible crosses in the animal kingdom. Even if his examples should prove wrong, Clark felt the basic principle behind Ellen White's statements was sound.

The following year the book was so highly regarded by the denomination that it was chosen as a ministerial reading course selection. But in the spring of that same year, Frank L. Marsh, then fresh from the University of Nebraska with a doctorate degree, noted that scientists had failed to find a single instance of hybrids between man and beast. Perhaps it would be better, he suggested, to accept Price's "the amalgamation of man and (of) beast" reading after all.

Before the end of 1941 Marsh completed his own *Fundamental Biology*, a 128-page mimeographed text that emphasized the lack of scientific evidence for belief in the ability of diverse organisms to cross.¹⁷ Ellen White, Marsh argued in the two chapters devoted to the amalgamation question, had not said man had crossed *with* beast. If confused species resulted from amalgamation, they were limited to hybrids between closely related animals of the same Genesis kind. If Ellen White said there has been union of man and beast, she would, said Marsh, "be in conflict with all laws of crossbreeding."¹⁸ In an exchange of letters

with Marsh in 1941, Clark argued that what could happen now was not a safe guide for determining what might have happened in the past and warned Marsh of the danger of falling into the uniformitarian error that has misled geologists.¹⁹

"If Ellen White said there has been union of man and beast, she would, said Marsh, 'be in conflict with all laws of crossbreeding.'"

On March 1, 1942, both Marsh and Clark completed papers defending their alternative positions and attacking opposing views. Clark's "Amalgamation: An Analysis of the Problem of Amalgamation" stressed that the expression proposed by Marsh—amalgamation of man (with man) and beast (with beast)—left "beast with beast" in an impossible situation. "In order to get any sense from it we must imply that it was a *sin* for one kind of animal to cross with another."²⁰

In his paper, "Analysis of the Amalgamation Statements," Marsh argued that crosses between the different kinds, including man and the anthropoid apes, were contrary to all the laws of genetics. To avoid implying that interracial marriage today still constituted a "base crime" or sin, Marsh wrote that, although Ellen White had called amalgamation *before* the Flood a "base crime," amalgamation after the Flood may not have been a sin at all.²¹

Further evidence that "the base crime of amalgamation of man and beast" did not refer to fusion of man and beast was found, said Marsh, "in the deletion of the amalgamation statements from the beautifully and carefully rewritten story in *Patriarchs and Prophets*," an account that contrasted sharply with the "loosely written" earlier essay.²² By this argument Marsh introduced one of the more curious issues to arise out of the amalgamation controversy: the literary style of *Spiritual Gifts* is so poor that a correct understanding

of the amalgamation statements is very difficult. Only *Patriarchs and Prophets* clearly indicates what Ellen White meant by "the one sin above another," namely, intermarriage between the righteous and wicked, he maintained.²³

Robinson and Clark, though sympathetic with Marsh's desire to reconcile the amalgamation statements with science, still agreed that Ellen White obviously had intended her readers to picture a sexual crime, and that amalgamation of man and beast after the Flood was the same activity as it was before the Flood; certainly it was just as much a "base crime." Furthermore, it seemed to them somewhat ironic to have amalgamation "counteract in part the degeneration of millenniums of Satanic activity" when it was amalgamation that supposedly had produced the degeneration in the first place.

"Unable to reconcile the most obvious reading of Ellen White's statements with science and with a commitment to the genetic equality among races, the church has accepted Marsh's ingenious interpretation. . . ."

Marsh remained undaunted. In *Evolution, Creation and Science*, completed in 1944, he argued that since it was the "Creator's obvious intention to keep the kinds separate," God must have created each kind with protoplasm that was "physiologically incompatible" with that of a different kind.²⁴

Clark soon answered Marsh, taking aim at his interpretation of amalgamation to mean crosses only between varieties of the same Genesis kind: "Assuming that the hybridization spoken of in *Spiritual Gifts* was between ecological races, we would have the word of Inspiration declaring in one place that normally fertile groups were allowable within the kind, but saying in another statement that the products of such races were denied entrance into the Ark

because they were confused, the result of processes that God did not approve."²⁵

By late 1946, however, the continuing advance of genetics, the apparent clash between science and revelation, and the need to address the racial implications of the traditional view of the amalgamation statements combined to make Marsh's interpretation appear increasingly attractive. In the summer of 1947, just before the confrontation in California, Marsh met privately in Washington, D.C., with General Conference President McElhany and several other denominational leaders who would attend the September meeting. He came at their invitation and spent an entire evening detailing his views and warning of the dangers associated with other interpretations both in the realms of science and racial relations. In retrospect, Marsh may have gone to California already the winner.

In California on September 8, 1947, both men had completed their presentations by 10:15 a.m.; Kern invited questions and discussions on the issues. Clark received most of the questions, and as the session continued it became apparent that most of the leaders, however they might feel about Ellen White's original intentions, clearly favored a position that could accommodate science and defuse the racial problems associated with the amalgamation statements. Marsh offered just such a solution. If his interpretation seemed a bit strained even to some of his supporters, it nevertheless was possible and reasonably defensible. After a break for lunch, the discussion resumed with about a third of the group missing, only to adjourn at 3 p.m. without a vote. At the close of the meeting Kern and Marsh discussed how the questions had gone and concluded that if a vote had been taken, it would have gone at worst 12 to 3 in Marsh's favor.

The church officials did not encourage either Clark or Marsh to write summaries of their views. However, when Marsh returned to Union College he thought a summary would be useful for his students.

On November 16, 1947, he completed an 11-page paper, "The Amalgamation Statements," and sent it to Clark suggesting that he, too, write a paper briefly summarizing his arguments. On March 1, 1948, Clark completed his "Amalgamation: A Study of Perplexing Statements Made by Mrs. E. G. White." It included a point-by-point rebuttal of Marsh's latest paper. To Marsh's suggestion that hybrids could only result from the crossing of the same "kind" of animal, for example, Clark again wanted to know why such an activity should constitute a "base crime."

When two such creatures crossbreed, they do not in any way produce a confused or corrupted kind. They merely make a new variant in the same kind. Such interbreeding seems to be the perfectly natural and orderly process.²⁶ Nor could Clark believe that "amalgamation of man and beast" after the Flood was not the same activity it was before the Flood, or that it in any way had decreased in sinfulness. Because Clark's paper replied to particular arguments in Marsh's past papers, Marsh decided to write just one more: "A Discussion of Harold W. Clark's Paper 'Amalgamation,' Published March 1, 1948."

The real battle was over, however, and these were primarily post-war skirmishes. Marsh's view had prevailed. In 1951, when

F. D. Nichol was preparing his *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, he requested all of Marsh's papers on amalgamation. Marsh sent them to him and Nichol leaned heavily on them for his chapter on the amalgamation statements.²⁷ The White Estate made available in 1968 a copy of Nichol's chapter under the title "Ellen G. White Statements Regarding Conditions at the Time of the Flood—by F. D. Nichol." This is still the paper sent to those who request an official statement on Ellen G. White and amalgamation.

For many years the Adventist community assumed Mrs. White believed that part of man's fall involved sexual amalgamation of man with beast and defended her views as scientific. After 1947 the dominant view changed and has continued for 35 years. Unable to reconcile the most obvious reading of Ellen White's statements with science and with a commitment to the genetic equality among races, the church has accepted Marsh's ingenious interpretation of what Ellen White meant. It may be that the present generation of Adventists will agree with the earliest generations of Adventists that—at least at one time—Ellen White did believe amalgamation of man with beast took place, but will not accept that view as scientifically authoritative today.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts, Important Facts of Faith in Connection with the History of Holy Men of Old* (Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1864), III, p. 64.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

3. The events of this meeting were reconstructed from accounts given to the author by Harold W. Clark and Frank L. Marsh and from papers written before and immediately after the 1947 meeting. I then sent a copy of my description to both Clark and Marsh for further comment and revision.

4. Uriah Smith, *The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White: A Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures* (Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1868), p. 103.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.*: "But does any one deny the general statement contained in the extract given above? They do not. If they did, they could easily be silenced by a reference to such cases as the wild Bushmen of Africa, some tribes of the Hottentots, and perhaps the Digger Indians of our own country, etc. Moreover, naturalists affirm that the line of

demarcation between the human and animal races is lost in confusion. It is impossible, as they affirm, to tell just where the human ends and the animal begins. Can we suppose that this was so ordained of God in the beginning? Rather has not sin marred the boundaries of these two kingdoms?" *Ibid.*

7. For a detailed account of the rise of the "American School" of anthropology see William Stanton, *The Leopard's Spots: Scientific Attitudes Toward Race in America, 1815-1859* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960).

8. Samuel George Morton, *Crania Americana; or A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America, to which is Prefixed an Essay on the Varieties of the Human Species* (Philadelphia, 1839), pp. 1-3. See William Scranton, *Leopard's Spots*, pp. 24-44.

9. Samuel Morton, "Hybridity in Animals, considered in reference to the question of the Unity of the Human Species," *American Journal of Science*, 1847, 3 (second series): 39-50, 203-212; also cited in William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-115. When Morton died in 1851 he was at the zenith of his

influence, lauded as one of America's greatest scientists. "One of the brightest ornaments of our age and country" eulogized the *New York Daily Tribune*, May 20, 1851, adding that "probably no scientific man in America enjoyed a higher reputation among scholars throughout the world, than Dr. Morton." Quoted in William Stanton, *Leopard's Spots*, p. 144.

10. James White, "New and Important Work," *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, XXXII, (Aug. 25, 1868), p. 160. Harold Clark, in commenting on James White's notice, wrote: "This work was carefully examined by James White with the almost certain implication that Mrs. White would also closely read it." Harold Clark, "Amalgamation: A Study in Perplexing Statements Made by Mrs. E. G. White," (March 1, 1948), p. 2. Although Clark questioned Smith's application to specific races, "yet it is evident that he [Uriah Smith] correctly understood what Mrs. White meant to say, for in 1870, when the statements were reprinted, no change was made in the wording. Changes were made in other publications where a wrong interpretation had been placed upon her words." *Ibid.*

11. This information appears as a handwritten note at the bottom of a copy of Uriah Smith's "Objection 39: The Negro Race Not Human," provided by Frank Marsh. Since James White had suggested in his *Review* notice that Smith's book was designed for "very wide circulation," it may be that he took these copies for sale at the various campmeetings that year.

12. George McCready Price, "The Problem of Hybridization," *The Ministry* (April 31, 1931), p. 13.

13. D. E. Robinson, "Amalgamation Versus Evolution," n.d., but written shortly after April, 1931, p. 1.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

16. Information in a letter to the author from Harold W. Clark (June 14, 1979). Both Robinson and W. C. White definitely believed that Ellen White meant amalgamation of man with beast.

17. Information in a letter to the author from Marsh (Feb. 8, 1979).

18. Information in a letter to the author from Marsh (Feb. 8, 1979).

19. Harold W. Clark to Frank L. Marsh, April 10, 1941 (courtesy of Frank L. Marsh).

20. Information in a letter to the author from Harold W. Clark (June 14, 1979). See also Harold W. Clark, "Amalgamation," (March 1, 1942. Francis D. Nichol, a church apologist who later championed Marsh's interpretation in his *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, actually would accept this strange suggestion. Animals were capable of "base crime" and "sin," Nichol argued, because they were violating natural law. F. D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics* (Washington, D.C.: The Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1951), p. 317.

21. Frank L. Marsh, "Analysis of the Amalgamation Statements," (unpublished paper, March 1, 1942), p. 5.

22. For example, see Frank L. Marsh, "The Amalgamation Statements," (unpublished paper, Nov. 16, 1947), pp. 4, 5. This argument has continued to the present and is reflected in F. D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White*. Marsh made the same argument in a question and answer session following his pre-

sentation on "Science and Religion" at Andrews University, Summer 1976, for the Ellen G. White Workshop. (From the author's transcript of the tape recorded session, p. 11).

23. See Marsh, "Amalgamation Within Genesis Kinds," June 11, 1942, pp. 1-4, and "The Amalgamation Statements," (unpublished paper, Nov. 16, 1947), p. 6. Also from information in a letter to the author from Frank L. Marsh (March 26, 1979). Other than the absence of the amalgamation statements, the changes in the various accounts are trivial. Compare *Spiritual Gifts*, III, pp. 61-74, with *The Spirit of Prophecy*, I, pp. 67-78, and *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 90-107.

A parallel reading of *Spiritual Gifts*, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, and *Patriarchs and Prophets*, however, shows a remarkable similarity. One can, in fact, easily follow the flow of ideas paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, noting where Ellen White added new material, right up to and including the last word before the paragraph that begins each amalgamation statement. The improvement in literary style in *Patriarchs and Prophets* seems to consist more in the deletion of the amalgamation statements than in substantive changes in language or rearrangement of ideas, and falls short of the transformation Marsh implied when he wrote: "The trained writer looks almost with horror at the lack of unity, coherence and emphasis in the 1864 essay. However, . . . in that description [*Patriarchs and Prophets*] the unity, coherence and emphasis of her essay are so above reproach as to leave no doubt as to what constituted the principle. . . ."

24. See Frank L. Marsh, *Evolution, Creation and Science* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1944), p. 140. Marsh requested that the notice of this book as a Ministerial Reading Course selection—stated on the title page of the first edition—be removed because it "seemed to prejudice some evolutionists (such as Dobshonsky)." From a letter to the author from Marsh, March 26, 1979. The Review and Herald omitted the notice beginning with the second printing.

25. Harold W. Clark, "Hybridization in Relation to Genesis Kinds," (Angwin, Calif.: May 1, 1945), p. 2. Leon Caviness, a professor of biblical languages at Pacific Union College, tried to strike a compromise in his short paper, "The Meaning of the Amalgamation Statements." Those who really wanted to discover what Ellen White originally intended by her statements must not overlook, he reasoned, that she reprinted the same expressions, unchanged, six years after the initial controversy and two years after Uriah Smith's defense. Caviness did not rule out the possibility of a cross between men and beast, but felt that the hybrid, if it could be produced, would not lead to the introduction of a new species intermediate between man and ape. Each cross would represent a single event, and the offspring would be incapable of further crossing. Caviness solved the racial problem associated with Mrs. White's statements by postulating products no longer produced and a process no longer functional at least between man and beast, but his compromise satisfied neither side. L. L. Caviness, "The Meaning of the Amalgamation Statements," n.d., pp. 1-2.

The same month Clark's essay appeared, Marsh responded with "The Basic Unit of Creation," an essay that used interfertility as the test for defining

the Genesis kinds. The resulting argument appeared to be circular. A year later he completed *Studies in Creationism*, a mimeographed text used during 1946 and 1947 as a reference for his classes at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C. Marsh devoted some twenty-five pages to the amalgamation question, again restating most of the previous arguments. The Review and Herald Publishing Association published a heavily revised

version of *Studies in Creationism* in 1950 that stressed the impossibility for Genesis kinds to cross, but completely omitted any discussion of the amalgamation problem itself.

26. Harold W. Clark, "Amalgamation, A revision of a paper issued March 1, 1942," (Angwin, Calif.: March 1, 1948).

27. Information in a letter to the author from Marsh (Jan. 10, 1979).

Ellen White & Doctrinal Conflict: Context of the 1919 Bible Conference

by Bert Haloviak
with Gary Land

From the late 1890s until the 1920s, the Seventh-day Adventist Church faced theological controversies over pantheism, the sanctuary, and the meaning of the "daily" (to early Adventists, "daily" was a crucial word found in Daniel 8:11-13 in the King James Bible). These controversies resulted in several leading figures leaving the denomination; moreover, they engendered ad-

ditional controversy over the doctrinal and historical authority of the writings of Ellen White. Indeed, the authority of Ellen White became the focus of discussion and an important source of the divisions at the 1919 Bible and History Teachers Conference. Even defenders of Ellen White developed divergent understandings of inspiration (see SPECTRUM, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 23-57). What follows is an account of this turbulent period of theological debate. The ideas debated then have some parallels today. Certainly opposing interpretations of the authority of Ellen White have re-emerged in strikingly similar terms.

Bert Haloviak, assistant director, Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, is a graduate of Columbia Union College, and holds an M.A. in history from the University of Maryland.

Gary Land, professor of history, Andrews University, holds his doctorate from the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Gary Land prepared for SPECTRUM this abridgement of two papers, written by Bert Haloviak in November 1979 and June 1980, originally titled, "In the Shadow of the 'Daily': Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference" and "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives: A. F. Ballenger and Divergent Paths to the Sanctuary."

Pantheism

The debate about pantheism had its roots in the aftermath of the 1888 General Conference. Out of prolonged discussions following the 1888 General Conference session debate over justification by faith